



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,135	01/25/2001	Spencer A. Rathus	660,034	8416

7590 05/23/2002
Ward & Olivo
382 Springfield Avenue
Summit, NJ 07901

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN CHAU N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/769,135

Applicant(s)

RATHUS ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 168-306 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 168-306 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

Prelim. Amdt/Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Preliminary Amendment filed 25 December 2001.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 188 and 190 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 188, line 2: Substitute "ISDN" with -- integrated service digital network (ISDN) --.

Re claim 190, line 2: Substitute "CATV" with -- cable television (CATV) --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Provisional Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

3. Claims 168, 174-225, 253-254, 256-257 and 270-306 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 168-221 and 224-263 of copending Application No. 09/769,149 (hereinafter '149).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because in claims 168, 174-225, 253-254, 256-257 and 270-306 of the instant application, Applicants claim a system for **displaying programming** to a user, the system comprising "a **printed travel ticket** having at least one **machine recognizable feature**", "a **feature recognition unit** having associated therewith a **means for recognizing** said feature and a **means for transmitting a coded signal** in response to the recognition of said feature", "an **intelligent controller** having associated therewith a **means for accessing** said programming material in response to receiving said coded signal", ... and "a **display unit** for presenting said programming material". The method of providing a

Art Unit: 2876

user access to programming material, comprising the steps of “**imprinting a machine recognizable feature**”, “**scanning** said machine recognizable feature”, “**transmitting data** associated with said machine recognizable feature”. The ‘149 patent discloses a system for **displaying programming** to a user, the system comprising “a **printed stationery** having at least one **machine recognizable feature**”, “a **feature recognition unit** having associated therewith a **means for recognizing** said feature and a **means for transmitting a coded signal** in response to the recognition of said feature”, “an **intelligent controller** having associated therewith a **means for accessing** said programming material in response to receiving said coded signal”, ... and “a **display unit** for presenting said programming material”. The method of providing a user access to programming material, comprising the steps of “**imprinting a machine recognizable feature**”, “**scanning** said machine recognizable feature”, “**transmitting data** associated with said machine recognizable feature”. Although the scope of claims 168, 174-225, 253-254, 256-257 and 270-306 of the present application and claims 168, 174-225, 253-254, 256-257 and 270-306 of ‘149 application are almost identical, the difference between the present claimed invention and the ‘149 application is that the present claimed invention is a narrower recitation of the ‘149 application (e.g., the present claimed invention recites “a **printed travel ticket** having at least one machine recognizable feature, etc.” whereby the ‘149 application recites “a **printed stationary** having at least one machine recognizable feature, etc.”). Thus, with respect to above discussions, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teaching of claims 168, 174-225, 253-254, 256-257 and 270-306 of ‘149 application as a general teaching for having a system for **displaying programming** to a user with the same functions as claimed by the present application. The instant claims obviously encompass the patented claims and differ only in terminology. To the extent that the instant claim is broaden and therefore generic to the patented claims [species], In re Goodman 29 USPQ 2d 2010

Art Unit: 2876

CAFC 1993, states that a generic claim cannot be issued without a terminal disclaimer, if a species claim has been previously been patented.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 168-174, 177, 179-180, 182-187, 189, 191-201, 204, 205, 215, 218-223, 225-230, 270-271, 273-275, 277-280, 284-290, 292, 295, 297, 299, 301-306 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brick et al (US 6,269,342) in view of Meade et al (US 5,021,984).

Re claims 168-174, 177, 179-180, 182-187, 189, 191-201, 204, 205, 215, 218-223, 225-230, 270-271, 273-275, 277-280, 284-290, 292, 295, 297, 299, 301-306: Brick et al discloses a system for

Art Unit: 2876

displaying programming to a user, the system comprising printed stationery having at least one machine recognizable feature 342 (fig. 10); a feature recognition unit 80 (fig. 9) having a means 356 (fig. 10) for recognizing the feature 342 and a means [338A, 358A] (fig. 10) for transmitting a coded signal in response to the recognition of the feature 342; an intelligent controller 334 (fig. 10) having a means for accessing the programming material in response to receiving the coded signal; and a display unit 362 (fig. 10) for presenting the programming material (see figs. 9 and 10; col. 9, line 1 through col. 12, line 67; and col. 13, lines 35+).

Brick et al fails to teach or fairly suggest that the printed stationery is a printed travel ticket.

Meade et al teaches the above limitation with printer 1 is a ticket issuing machine (figs. 1-3; col. 3, lines 18+).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Meade et al into the teachings of Brick et al in order to provide Brick et al with a universal system wherein the machine can be used in merchandize store for issuing product's tags and can be used in transportation department for issuing travel tickets. Furthermore, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Brick et al, and therefore an obvious expedient.

7. Claims 175-176, 178, 181, 203, 206, 208 -209, 211, 213-214, 216-217, 224, 253-254, 256-257, 272, 276, 281-282, 293-294, 296 and 298 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brick et al as modified by Meade et al as applied to claim 168 above, and further in view of Rhoads (US 6,311,214). The teachings of Brick et al as modified by Meade et al have been discussed above.

Re claims 175-176, 178, 181, 203, 206, 208 -209, 211, 213-214, 216-217, 224, 253-254, 256-257, 272, 276, 281-282, 293-294, 296 and 298: Brick et al/Meade et al have been discussed above but

Art Unit: 2876

fail to teach or fairly suggest that the data link comprising image/video/sound data link and the machine-readable feature comprises a digital watermark.

Rhoads teaches the above limitation with the data link comprising image/video/sound data link (col. 22, lines 1+); and the machine-readable feature comprises a digital watermark (col. 13, lines 5-40); also see figs. 1-2 and col.2, line 64 through col. 4, line 46; col. 8, line 8 through col. 10, line 59; col. 14, line 55 through col. 15, line 13; col. 18, lines 30+; col. 19, line 65 through col. 20, line 49; col. 22, lines 1+; col. 34, lines 5+; col. 36, lines 46+.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Rhoads into the teachings of Brick et al/Meade et al in order to provide Brick et al/Meade et al with the latest technology, providing the user/operator with a clearer information data displayed. Furthermore, such modification would have provided the user/operator flexibility in selecting a desired format of previewing data. Moreover, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Brick et al/Meade et al for aesthetic purpose (i.e., digital watermark machine-readable feature), well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient

8. Claims 188, 190, 197, 207, 210, 212, 283, 291 and 300 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brick et al as modified by Meade et al as applied to claim 168 above, and further in view of Reber et al (US 5,995,105). The teachings of Brick et al as modified by Meade et al have been discussed above.

Re claims 188, 190, 197, 207, 210, 212, 283, 291 and 300: Brick et al/Meade et al have been discussed above but fails to teach or fairly suggest that the machine-readable feature is invisible; the data link comprising an integrated service digital network, a cable television line; and the display having a pager.

Art Unit: 2876

Reber et al teaches the above limitation with an invisible machine-readable barcode (col. 4, lines 41-45); the data link comprising an ISDN, cable television system (col. 5, lines 14+ and col. 9, lines 20+); and the system having a two-way pagers (col. 3, lines 66+).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Reber et al into the teachings of Brick et al/Meade et al in order to provide Brick et al/Meade et al with the latest technology for a more accurate and faster system due to the benefit of ISDN networking line. Furthermore, such modification would have provided Brick et al/Meade et al with a more secure system via invisible machine-readable feature. Moreover, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Brick et al/Meade et al with a more user-friendly system due to the system's properties (i.e., faster, more accuracy and more secure), well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

9. Claims 231-269 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brick et al as modified by Meade et al as applied to claim 168 above, and further in view of DeLorme et al (US 5,948,040). The teachings of Brick et al as modified by Meade et al have been discussed above.

Re claims 231-269, Brick et al/Meade et al have been discussed above but fails to teach or fairly suggest a travel guide information.

DeLorme et al teaches the above limitation with a travel guide (figs. 1c-8; col. 22, line 63 through col. 30, line 65).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of DeLorme et al into the teachings of Brick et al/Meade et al in order to provide Brick et al/Meade et al with a more flexibility system wherein the system is capable to provide the user all of his/her desired information ahead of time about the location that he/she plan to go to before he/she is planning for a vacation/trip, and thus providing a more user-friendly system.

Art Unit: 2876

Furthermore, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Brick et al/Meade et al, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Greenberg (US 4,711,994); Baitz et al (US 5,412,191); Bravman et al (US 5,401,944); Withnall et al (US 4,488,035); Wahlberg (US 3,705,384); and Schr (US 6,085,976) are cited as of interest and illustrate a similar structure to a method and apparatus for accessing electronic data via a familiar printed medium.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-5588. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T and TR-F 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Uyen-Chau N. Le

May 20, 2002


MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800